

From the N. Y. Tribune.
THE EAGLES OF COLUMBIA.
A NATIONAL SONG.—BY THE "PEASANT SARD."

The Eagles of Columbia!
How gallantly they fly,
With vengeance in their awful swoop,
Wit lightning in their eye!
When perched upon our standard bright
Above our stripes and stars,
They shall wave o'er the brave
In the thunder-storm of Mars.

The colors of Columbia!—
Her son who roams the earth,
Tho' frozen at the icy pole,
Or scorched on Cancer's hearth,
Shall look upon them, and forget
His sufferings and woes,
For they wave o'er the brave
Where the breeze of ocean blows.

The soldier, ere the signal flies
Along the waiting line,
Beholds his country's bird with pride
And kindles at the shrine!
Resolved thro' blood and carnage dire
To bear it safely,
It shall wave o'er the brave
In the sulphur cloud of war.

The sailor, ere the foam strikes,
Aloft shall glance his eye
To where, fast nailed for victory,
Columbia's pennons fly;
And when the vollied thunder breaks,
Forth ushering death and woe,
They shall wave o'er the brave
On the gory decks below.

When Peace, with all her smiling train,
Moves gently thro' the land,
And patriots to their homes retire,
And sheath the glittering brand—
Victoriously our Eagles fly
When war's commotions cease;
They shall wave o'er the brave
In the stilling breeze of Peace.

GILL, Mass., Aug. 19, 1844.

From the Baltimore Sun.

THE SABBATH.

Hark! the temple's solemn chime!
'Tis the Holy Sabbath time,
'Tis the day forever blest
As the Christian's time for rest.
Hark! the gentle invitation
To repose and adoration!
Something in the Sabbath toll
Soothes the mind and wins the soul;
Telling men of Heaven's care,
And attuning hearts to prayer.

Hark! the sounds go up to Heaven,
Whence came down the precious leaven,
E'en as happy earth should try
Songs responsive to the sky.
Softer seem the winds to blow,
Calmer seems the earth to grow,
Balmier the breath of day,
Holier the sunny ray,
Brighter seemed the arched skies,
As the sounds of prayer arise!

'Tis the rapt and solemn pause
Of the Great First guiding Cause!
Who from mighty labor staid,
When the beautiful world was made,
When the land, in verdant pride,
Rose the waters to divide,
When the light broke at 'The World'
And first life in Eden stirred,
Then He spoke as there he stood,
'It is done, and it is good!'

Holy Sabbath! Let us pray
New returns of the day,
From the hills of caroling care,
Saddened thought and dark despair.
Mortal things that fret the soul
'Till it sinks in their control,
From the blight of stubborn will,
Holy Sabbath save us still!
Hark! the temple's solemn chime!
'Tis the Holy Sabbath time!

From the Nashville Union.

Another Letter from Gen. Jackson on the Texas Question.

HERMITAGE, August 28, 1844.

DEAR SIR:—I am in possession of your note of the 27th inst., and, although greatly enfeebled by the excessive warm weather of this month, shall endeavor to reply to it.

The more I have reflected on the policy of annexing Texas to the United States, the more decided is my conviction, that since the establishment of the Federal Constitution, no question has arisen of so great importance to the welfare and safety of the people of the United States. It seems to me that in this instance, as in the Revolution and our last war with Great Britain, kind Providence still interposes to help on our efforts in the cause of self-government, and to give us the necessary guaranty for our independence.

Under the treaty of 1803, by which Mr. Jefferson obtained Louisiana from France, the people of that country acquired the right to incorporation in our Union as simple and complete as that possessed by the original States and their territories, and all the corresponding rights of citizenship and protection. In the treaty, of 1819, by which the people of Louisiana, west of the Sabine, were deprived of the guarantees of the treaty of 1803, a serious question arises whether this government can dismember its territory and disfranchise its citizens without their consent, and in the case of Texas, without the consent of France. But leaving out of view this solemn question, and looking only at the consequences which have followed the treaty of 1819, it is wonderful that the course of events is such as to enable us to repair the errors of that treaty, at the same time that we avoid doing wrong to other powers, either on this or the continent of Europe.

The people of Texas have maintained their separate existence, and, after years of battle and toil, have achieved their freedom and independence. And without a stain on their character, without violating obligations with Mexico or other foreign powers, with no restraint on their sovereignty other than that which has been imposed by their God, they again come back to us, and tell us that although the guarantees of the treaty of 1803 have been withdrawn from them, they are yet willing to embrace them. And the question is, what shall we say to them in reply?

But before answering this question, let us see if Mexico has any right to the territory of Texas, or any cause for resisting the extension to the citizens of Texas of the guarantees of citizenship as intended in the treaty of 1803. When did Mexico acquire any title to the territory of Texas? The title of France was conveyed to us, and that title was then recognized by all the civilized world as the only good one. Did we convey it to Mexico? We did not. We conveyed it to old Spain, and she did not convey it to Mexico. How, then, does Mexico derive her title? She pretends to none except what results from the consideration which was formed in 1824, and founded on revolution, in which compact Texas expressly stipulated that her separate sovereignty was retained. The overthrow of that confederation or compact by military force gives Mexico no title to the territory, unless she can show that she has conquered one—and if we examine the claim on the score of conquest, it is notoriously unjust. That claim was

silenced by the battle of San Jacinto; after which event the principal powers of the world recognized Texas as an independent State. There is, then, no reason for the opposition now made by Mexico to the annexation of Texas to the United States—none founded on any just claim to the territory or the loyalty of the citizens of Texas.

We are then brought to the unembarrassed question: is it right for us to possess Texas on the reasonable terms proposed by her? Is it a step necessary to our safety and prosperity? I say it is, and as you have requested my reasons, I will briefly state them.

That territory is represented by Mr. Thompson and other gentlemen of character who have the means of judging correctly, as possessing some of the finest lands in the world. In soil, climate and productions, it is said to surpass the Floridas, and to equal Louisiana and Mississippi. As a portion of our confederacy, then, will it not benefit us in the same manner that the States just mentioned and the other new States have done? Have not these States contributed to the wealth, safety and prosperity of the other portions of the confederacy? Have they not furnished homes for thousands and thousands of happy and free people engaged in the noble pursuit of agriculture, and have not the products of this agriculture, exchanged in our own and foreign markets, given healthful employment to our manufacturing and navigating interests, and to the various mechanical arts? Unless the measure of our prosperity is different from that which is applicable to all other nations, it is impossible to resist the conclusion, that it will be promoted by the annexation of Texas. This conclusion I deem self-evident.

But great are the advantages of annexation in the encouragement which will result to our industrial pursuits—advantages in which all sections of the Union will participate—they are not so important as the security which Texas in a military point of view offers us. It is in this aspect of the question that I shudder when I look at the course of the newspaper press opposed to annexation, and read the speeches of many public men—who, absorbed in the effort to make a President, seem to care nothing for the intrigues of Great Britain to defeat our true policy.

We have labored many years to free the States composing our Union of the Indian population within our limits, and may be said to have just succeeded in the accomplishment of this humane policy. These Indians are now placed on our western frontier, and in a territory favorable to their gradual civilization and protection, against the infusion of influences hostile to them and to us. At present they are not accessible to British influence, except on the northern boundary line. Is it not apparent, however, that the whole of our policy in respect to their civilization, will be thwarted if any foreign power acquires control over Texas? The line between Texas and these Indians extends some thousands of miles and communicates with Oregon in the most direct and practicable route to the great river that that territory, Texas, therefore, in hostile hands, could feed and sustain an army that could not only act against Oregon, but at the same time against Louisiana and Arkansas, and by conjunction with the Indians could make inroads on every western State to the lakes. An army thus employed, seconded by a proper organization of force on the lakes, would put the whole west in a blaze, and cause us more injury in blood and money in six months, than years of peace could atone for.

The sagacious statesmen of England understand much better than we do the force of the military considerations I am here suggesting: and hence, you will find that no pecuniary obligations will be deemed by them too great to prevent the annexation to this country. The success of our free system, its capacity to secure order, to promote the progress of the arts and sciences, and to stimulate the energies of our nature to a point far higher than any yet attained under the forms of government in the old world, is all owing to the advocates of monarchy. The further progress of our principles will be a demonstration which the popular mind throughout the world cannot mistake, and opposition to these principles is therefore a necessary part of European policy; and it would be as short sighted for us to take for granted that a different feeling will control their policy, as it would be for one of our navigators to embark on the ocean without chart or needle, to aid him in weathering storms and preventing shipwreck. So settled do I consider this antagonistic feature of monarchy and republicanism, in the present state of the world, that I would feel safe in inferring what our course ought to be in reference to this measure of such vital national interest, by finding out what was the course of Great Britain. Their position here, as it has been generally heretofore, will be found to be directly opposite to ours.

But why should I press upon you further views of the paramount importance of Texas to the United States on the score of safety? Every mind conversant with the operations of war, and with the causes which give military ascendancy, must see from a glance at our map, that such a genius as Wellington's or Napoleon's, sustained by naval armaments on the Gulf of Mexico, and on the lakes, and in possession of Texas, with a very small force on land, could, in one campaign, paralyze one half of our Union, deprive us of Oregon, and produce scenes of servile insurrection and massacre, that humanity would shudder to describe. This is no fancy sketch—no chimera of the imagination, to frighten women and children. It is the natural operation of cause and effect—inevitable and irresistible.

Give Texas and Oregon to Great Britain, and she will have more territory on this continent than the United States. She will surround us from our northeast corner to our southeast corner. Leaving no outlet to us by land, we shall be literally embraced in her potent grasp, and open to her invasion by sea and land, at every point of the Union.

And yet we are told by leading politicians of the day, that the project of annexation is a mere bubble blown for a political purpose, to put down a leader and put up another; and this too on the face of assurances that reach us every day, which tell us that England holds in her hands a guarantee of peace to Texas, if she will only withdraw the proposition of union with us. I am proud to see that my friends throughout the Union are treating these foreign menaces as Americans should who love their country, and are determined to stand by it in all emergencies without regard to party.

Let us next see, in answer to your third, fourth and fifth inquiries, what would be the probable effect of the determination of Texas to accept the guarantee of monarchical powers. A Treaty of commerce would be the first result, and the basis of this treaty would be one of reciprocal benefit, in the exchange of the raw productions of Texas for the manufactured articles of those powers.

England would aim at once to destroy the manufacturing interest of this country in competition with her; to do this, she would be the gainer by opening her ports to Texas; and Texas in her turn, first anxious for the payment of her national debt, would so adjust her revenue laws as to give the greatest possible stimulus to the culture of her cotton and tobacco, and the development of all her agricultural resources. Thus her debt would soon be paid, and her prosperity would then be accelerated by the double force of European aid and domestic pride—unembarrassed on the one hand by high duties, upheld on the other by the deep-seated determination of the European powers to cripple the United States and scatter among them the seeds of discord and jealousy.

Among other disadvantages resulting to us from such a treaty between England and Texas, would be the necessity to establish, on that extensive frontier such police as would prevent smuggling and enforce our revenue laws. Could this be done? All experience answers, no—it cannot be done. Border citizens, having the same interests in trade, following the same pursuits, using the same in-

land streams for the transportation of their surplus labor, will not submit to the operation of unequal laws. The cotton planter on the south-western boundary, within the United States, will not contribute to the enforcement of the laws, the effect of which makes his labor less profitable than that of his neighbor in Texas: and what is true of cotton will be true of all other agricultural products. We know that at present, in the United States, the force of this principle is so strong as to compel us to put low duties on many articles which would be otherwise heavily taxed.

I know that many of our citizens suppose that the annexation of Texas will be injurious because it will add to the quantity of valuable lands in the market, and may be the means of inducing the removal of many of our slaves to that favored region. I grant that this is true to some extent; but does it not increase the arguments in favor of annexation? If Texas has an advantage in cheapness of land salubrity of climate and convenience of navigation, over our southern States, is it not better for the citizens of the United States to possess this advantage than surrender it to the citizens of Europe? In the hands of Great Britain this advantage will be improved, as we have seen, to break up our manufacturers and lessen our capacity to compete with her in the supply of other markets and in the carrying trade. In other words, will not Texas, out of our Union be a more formidable competitor than she would be in it? The iron and coal regions of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky and Tennessee, if she is in the Union, will find a market there—so will the Lowell and other cotton manufactures of the North Atlantic side of our Union. The immense power of the Atlantic side of our Union. The immense power of our inland trade, the nursery of our seamen, and the source of so much wealth, will find employment in Texas, if she is in the Union. If she is out of the Union, British policy may monopolize all these advantages.

We are also told by some who profess to speak on behalf of the sugar planters in Louisiana that Texas must not come into the Union, for, if she does, their lands are made less valuable, and the price of sugar will fall. If the fact were so, does it follow that an argument is thereby afforded for the rejection of Texas? This would only prove to the vast number of the consumers of sugar that Texas ought to be added to the Union. But it is probable that the price of sugar would fall! We know that the production of Louisiana is now so limited, that the large protective duty extended to it has, thus far, not diminished the revenue from this article; and we also know, that the lands of Texas could not be brought into cultivation for many years. So that the probability is, that sugar, in Texas, would stand on the same footing with cotton and other agricultural productions, far more advantageous to the United States if in the Union than out of it. But were it otherwise, I feel confident that the sugar planters of Louisiana will repel the imputation that, on account of a possible competitor being raised up in Texas, they are willing to see that fair country pass into the hands of England. The sugar planter wants security for his negro property, stability for the Union, and independence for his whole country. To gain this, he will make the same sacrifice, if necessary, that the other great interests would make. But fortunately, no sacrifices are necessary, according to my view of the subject. All the interests and all the sections of our Union, instead of having sacrifices to make, will only have benefits to enjoy.

There are many other aspects in which it can be made manifest that England will injure the United States if it is rejected. But they are too obvious to bring to your notice.—Take those already noted—take the question as it stands—the indisposition of the United States to profit by them is the most remarkable event that has occurred in history. No nation, under similar circumstances, has committed such error. If there be patriotism in the effort to increase the wealth and happiness of all classes in our society—to diffuse the blessings of equal laws, and a just government—if there be love in the spirit which finds in this free land of ours the means to spread the light of the gospel, and to teach fallen man throughout the world how he may recover his right to civil and religious liberty—it seems to me that all this patriotism—all this philanthropy—all this religion—appeals to us in favor of the addition of Texas to our Union.

But it has been asked, not by you, but by others, if these cogent reasons exist, why did they not influence me when I was President? My answer is, that at that time the people of Texas had existed as a separate sovereignty but a few months before the close of my administration, and were then at war with Mexico, not claiming the benefits of the treaty of 1803, and not objecting to the cession of the Territory of Old Spain in 1819. The independence of Texas was recognized the last day of my administration. I was not responsible for the policy which dismembered that Territory, and had no power to remedy the consequences of that dismemberment. It was my duty to be just to both Mexico and Texas, and keep the United States from becoming a party to their quarrel. This duty was faithfully performed. No interference on the part of this Government was encouraged or countenanced. The brave Texas troops, acting for themselves, terminated at St. Jacinto their contest for liberty, and then settled their title and claim to independence. From that period to this our relations to them have been changed, and the question of the proposed connection with them has now ceased to be embarrassed by the designs or expectations of Mexico.

The dismemberment of our territory in 1819, by the failure to execute the guaranty in the treaty of 1803, has but recently attracted public attention. But it has been silently operating, and is now exercising a great and momentous influence on our system of Government. It has been thus with most of the causes that have produced changes in human affairs—unforeseen—perhaps hardly noticed in the beginning—but not the less potent in the result after the lapse of time when connected with a vital principle. May we not trust that this mistake of our Statesmen in 1819, has been ordered by a wise providence, as a lesson for us never hereafter to dismember any portion of our Territory, or permit, under any circumstances, a foreign power to acquire a foothold on our free soil.

I have thus, my friend, delineated as rapidly and truly as I could, the views I take of the question of annexation. I shall probably not be alive to witness the consummation of any of my anticipations, but I have the consolation of knowing that I have contributed what I could to guard my country against the danger of yielding to the suggestions of those who advocate the policy aimed at by Great Britain.

I remain, as usual, your friend,
Moses Davidson, Esq. ANDREW JACKSON.

"What is Dorr imprisoned for?" asked an English gentleman, who came over in the *Hibernia*, of a staunch Democrat of this city, on Wednesday.
"For high treason to King George II, of Great Britain," was the prompt and true reply.
Boston Times.

From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Young Hickory.

JAMES K. POLK.

Reasons why he should be supported by all true friends of law, order, morality, and democracy.

He is a man of irreproachable moral character, and contrasts in that respect with the whig candidate.

He is not loaded down with the guilt of murder, meditated or accomplished, like the whig candidate.
No widow and orphans weep the loss of a husband and father, slain under his counsels, as in the case of Calley and the whig candidate.

The gaming table has not seen him robbing his infatuated or half-intoxicated fellow-man of his money or his property, as it has the whig candidate.

The brothel has never resounded with the noise of his profligate mirth and obscene jest, as in the case of the whig candidate.

He is not chargeable with the crimes of violating the constitution and his oath, by acting in a legislative body, with a perfect consciousness that he had not the constitutional qualifications, as did the whig candidate in the Senate of the United States.

He has not violated constitutions and oaths of office, by attempting to kill members of the legislative bodies for words spoken in debate, as in the case of H. Marshall and John Randolph, as did the whig candidate.

He has not been the first to provoke the violation of a law to suppress dueling, voted for by himself, like the whig candidate.

He has not, like Henry Clay, been put under bonds to prevent his headlong passions rushing him into the penitentiary, under a law passed with the aid of his own vote.

He has not, like Henry Clay, abused the frontier settlers as "a lawless rabble," no better than thieves, pirates, and robbers, denying them the privilege of buying wilderness lands which they have, by hard work, made "to blossom as the rose," while willing to aid profligate debtors in wiping out all their debts by a bankrupt law.

He has not, like Henry Clay, refused to the poor Irishman or German, or other emigrants from the Old World, the privilege of making a lot of waste land valuable by his labor, and buying it at government price; nor, like the same profligate statesman, would he permit foreign lords to purchase all the bank and corporation stocks in the country, and become the owners of a national bank, to control the value of property and the wages of labor—to keep the moneys of the treasury, corrupt public men, and govern the government.

He has none of the haughty contempt for the laboring millions, which would induce him, like Henry Clay, to sink the white working man below the negro slaves.

He has not, like Henry Clay, when instructed by his constituents to give a vote for a President, or for the repeal or passage of a law, set himself up as their master, haughtily answered "I will not," and insulted them with imputations of cruelty and inhumanity, for making the request.
He has not, like Henry Clay, gotten up a scheme to destroy a prominent rival—refused to make himself publicly responsible for matters which he was privately incalculating far and wide to his injury—been denounced and defied by him as an intriguer, who dared not put his name to imputed slanders, which he was not too honorable to propagate; and then with a view to his personal aggrandizement, rush into his arms, as Mr. Clay did into those of Mr. Adams, and make common cause with him against old friends, and in support of principles he had repudiated and denounced.

Mr. Polk was the steadfast friend of General Jackson and the measures of his administration, while Mr. Clay was his bitter and unrelenting enemy.

From the Dedham (Mass.) Democrat.

Our Candidate for President.

We occasionally run upon an article on the merits of Governor Polk, penned by some impartial observer of him, which must have weight with many an honest mind.

We now append to this an article cut from the American Traveller of July 10, 1838, a paper whose sympathies are all with the Clay party. The article appeared at first in the New York Mirror, and the writer of it was evidently not a political friend. Read it candidly:

"HON. JAMES K. POLK, OF TENNESSEE.

—The speaker of the House is, considering the high station he occupies, a young man; his age is between forty and forty-five. In his person he is rather spare, and about five feet nine inches in height. His hair is dark, with a slight sprinkling of gray about the temples. His countenance is very expressive, and, except when something occurs to disturb his equanimity, is indicative of good nature, and very often lighted up by a smile. His eyes are bright and searching, and an excitement within is more visible through them than through those of almost any individual within my knowledge. As a debator on the floor of the House, he always acquitted himself well; energy and quickness of apprehension are his characteristics, and, as the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, he had ample opportunity to call all his efforts into requisition. Any subject which he undertakes to investigate, he enters into with all his powers; and it is never left until sifted to the bottom. In debating, rhetorical figures are seldom re-

sorted to by him—poetry and flourish are left for those who wish to tickle the imagination—while he contents himself with sound and convincing argument, plainly but forcibly put forth; and he never loses sight for a moment of the point in issue.

"Since he has accepted the speaker's chair, his efforts have been untiring to perfect himself in parliamentary law, and to administer it with impartiality; and while he presides over the deliberations of the House with all the dignity due the situation of presiding officer over the representatives of a great and free people, there is mingled with his manners a plain, unostentatious bearing which does honor to himself, and is in keeping with the true principles of a republican government. This pharisaical pride which exclaims—'our eyrie buildeth in the cedar's top'—belongs not to James K. Polk; he is a democrat in principle and in practice, and every man who has had any personal intercourse with him, will agree with the writer hereof in the opinion, that honesty of purpose, uprightness of principle, and an exalted sense of moral responsibility, are the beacon lights which guide his course across the ocean of existence.

"He was elected speaker, it is true by a party vote, and is, as the speaker of the American House of Representatives must always necessarily be, a party man; and, under the peculiar circumstances of his election, the place, during the first session which he filled it, was rendered as embarrassed as possible. Questions of order were multiplied upon him, and he was called upon to give constructions to the *lex parliamentaria* upon every question where, by possibility, a question could be started. He passed through the trial, however, with honor to himself and with satisfaction to those who elected him; and his urbanity and gentlemanly bearing was such, as to disarm even his opponents of their rancor.

"Though, at times, Colonel Polk may appear to his political opponents to be governed by party feelings in the course he pursues in discharging the duties of speaker, I do not believe any consideration would tempt him, intentionally, to swerve one hair's breadth from what he honestly believed to be his duty; he is the consequence of what they may, he will ever be found pursuing that course which he thinks will result most honorably to his country."

Rich and Poor.

It may fare hardly, perhaps, with some of the former by and bye, but on this earth, or at least this portion of it—so long as it remains under Whig dominion—it is on the whole a very comfortable thing to be rich. Witness, for example, the truly paternal solicitude for their interests, in contradistinction from those of the great mass of the laboring poor, exhibited in the arrangement of the provisions of the present tariff. We trust that while so well "taken care off" by the polite attentions of a government that "knows how to treat a gentleman as a gentleman," they will not forget their reciprocal duty of themselves "taking care of the poor." The following comparative view of the different rules of taxation applied by Whig legislation to the "upper" and "lower classes," may not be new to our readers, as it has been for some time going the rounds of the democratic press before the *News* sprang into existence; but we are satisfied that none of our readers will find fault with its production:—*N. Y. News*.

INDUSTRY REWARDED.

	per cent.
The rich man's spice,	40 to 75
The manufacturer's wool,	5
The Alderman's spices,	40 to 77
Gems and Pearls for the ladies,	8
Gentlemen's neckcloths,	30 to 78
Gold safety chains for the exquisite,	20
Sweetmeats, &c. for tea table,	25
Gold trinkets for the ball room,	20
Porcelain and China ware for show,	30
Games for luxury, and silks and ribbons to promote bankruptcy,	23 to 30
Coach lace for the man in his gilded coach,	35
Feathers and artificial flowers,	35
Fans for lolling effeminacy,	25
Needles for embroidery, &c.	30
Thread, and gold, and silver laces for tinelled vanity,	15
Diamonds and the cameo for the loungers about town,	7
Cosmetics and perfumery for toilet,	25
Paints and essences for decayed beauty and faded virtue,	15 to 25
Costly wines for the civic feast,	50 to 93
Sardines preserved for the few,	20
Condiments to stimulate the pallid appetites of retired affluence,	30
Billet-doux and fancy paper for bipped butterflies,	30
Silk robes and embroidery,	20 to 30
For the manufacturer's use, 170 enumerated articles,	15 to 30

IDLENESS REPROVED.

	per cent.
The poor man's salt,	100 to 170
The farmer's cloth,	40
The ploughman's spice,	114 to 150
Bootees and shoes,	40
Workingman's shirt,	90 to 150
Iron drag-chains for the woodman,	175
Sugar and molasses to sweeten the food of necessity,	65 to 107
Common glassware for use,	152 to 389
Beef and pork, for necessity, and fannels to promote health,	40 to 120
Bookeings and balizes,	55 to 60
Bags and cotton bagging for the planter and producer,	30 to 90
Pins for absolute necessity,	60 to 70
Brass kettles for the kitchen,	48
Cordage and tarred rope for the weather-beaten mariner,	66 to 130
Iron and steel for the industrious and useful artisan,	75 to 100
Hard soap for the poor man,	320
Paints and oils for mechanics,	49 to 100
Barley for rural small beer,	320
Herrings, dried, for the million,	77
Condiments to give zest and relish to the frugal meal,	25 to 190
Medium and foolscap paper,	97 to 160
Sailors' fustian jackets, &c., for farmers' and mechanics' use	30 to 389

From the New York Plebeian.

The Retrograde Movement of Whiggery.

Whig Loss since 1840.

The Presidential vote in 1840 exhibited a Whig majority of 145,865, excluding South Carolina. Since then the State elections have exhibited a succession of Democratic victories.

The following table will show the Federal loss, and the Democratic gain, in 17 States. The result is compiled from authentic sources, and refers to the most recent election for Governor in the States. They show conclusively that Whiggery is progressing backwards, and that every new trial seems to increase their speed. No candid man, be he Whig or Democrat, can examine the figures without forming the conclusion that Henry Clay, and all his Federal measures, are doomed to a defeat for which there will be no parallel in former party triumphs.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Whig majority in 1840 20900

" " 1843 3651

Whig loss 17373

MAINE.

Whig majority in 1840 811

Dem. " 1844 8006

Whig loss 8811

VERMONT.

Whig majority in 1840 14400

" " 1844 about 4000

Whig loss 10400

RHODE ISLAND.

Whig majority in 1840 1877

" " 1843 1741

Whig loss 136

CONNECTICUT.

Whig majority in 1840 6301

" " 1843 1241

Whig loss 5060

NEW YORK.

Whig majority in 1840 12900

Dem. " 1842 21900

Whig loss 35800

PENNSYLVANIA.

Whig majority in 1840 340

Dem. " 1841 23000

Whig loss 23360

DELAWARE.

Whig majority in 1840 9000

" " 1842 9

Whig loss 9001

MARYLAND.

Whig majority in 1840 4776

" " 1841 631

Whig loss 5407

NORTH CAROLINA.

Whig majority in 1840 12500

" " 1844, about 3000

Whig loss 9500

GEORGIA.

Whig majority in 1840 8211

" " 1843 2000

Whig loss 6211